

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Chew* (U.S. Patent 6,389,560). Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Vrhel, Jr., et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,543,047). Claims 1-8 are cancelled.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Vrhel, Jr. et al.* and further in view of *Jessen et al.* (U.S. 5,410,681). Claims 9-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Vrhel, Jr. et al.* and further in view of *Chew*.

Independent Claims 9 and 25 include:

Claim 9. A method comprising:

providing a computer system including a first connection and a second connection, one of the connections being a wireless connection;

providing a testing system for testing hardware and software configurations in the computer system, the testing system having a first connection and a second connection;

setting a first switching device coupled to the respective first connections to cause a first one of a first plurality of devices to be coupled to a computer system;

setting a second switching device coupled to the respective second connections to cause a first one of a second plurality of devices to be coupled to the computer system;

coupling a control module to the first and second switching devices, to an additional switching device and to a third plurality of devices;

booting the computer system;

detecting the first one of the first plurality of devices using the computer system; and  
detecting the first one of the second plurality of devices using the computer system.

Claim 25. A system comprising:

a computer system that includes a first connection and a second connection, one of the connections being a wireless connection;  
a testing system for testing hardware and software configurations in the computer system, the testing system having a first connection and a second connection;

a coupling interconnecting the respective first and second connections of the computer system and the testing system;

a first switching device coupled to the respective first connections;  
a first plurality of devices coupled to the first switching device;  
a second switching device coupled to the respective second connections;  
a second plurality of devices coupled to the second switching device;  
the first switching device being able to be set to cause a first one of the first plurality of devices to be coupled to the computer system;

the second switching device being able to be set to cause a first one of the second plurality of devices to be coupled to the computer system;

a control module coupled to the first and second switching devices, to an additional switching device and to a third plurality of devices; and

the computer system configured to detect the first one of the first plurality of devices and the first one of the second plurality of devices in response to a)  
the first switching device being set to cause the first one of the first plurality of devices to be coupled to the computer system and b) the second switching

device being set to cause the first one of the second plurality of devices to be coupled to the computer system, and in response to being booted.

Applicants traverse these rejections on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP § 2142:

...The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the Applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness....the Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made....The Examiner must put aside knowledge of the Applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'"

The combined references fail to teach or suggest the claimed method and system.

Therefore, there is simply no basis in the art for combining the references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection because neither reference teaches or even suggests the desirability of the combination. Moreover, neither reference provides any incentive or motivation supporting the desirability of the combination.

The MPEP §2143.01 provides:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, the Examiner's combination arises solely from hindsight based on the invention without any showing of suggestion, incentive or motivation in either reference for the combination.

Thus, the Examiner's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met.

The Federal Circuit has, on many occasions, held that there was no basis for combining references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection. For example, in *In re Geiger*, the court stated in holding that the PTO "failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness":

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Monteffiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Federal Circuit has also repeatedly warned against using the applicant's disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention out of isolated teachings in the prior art. See, e.g., *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products*, 840 F.2d 902, 907, 5 USPQ2d 1798, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1989).


More recently, the Federal Circuit found motivation absent in *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In this case, the court concluded that the board had "reversibly erred in determining that one of [ordinary] skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these references in a manner that rendered the claimed invention [to have been] obvious." The court noted that to "prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the references that create the

case of obviousness." The court further noted that there were three possible sources for such motivation, namely "(1) the nature of the problem to be solved; (2) the teachings of the prior art; and (3) the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." Here, according to the court, the board had relied simply upon "the high level of skill in the art to provide the necessary motivation," without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination. Notably, the court wrote: "If such a rote invocation could suffice to supply a motivation to combine, the more sophisticated scientific fields would rarely, if ever, experience a patentable technical advance."

Therefore, independent claims 9 and 25 and the claims dependent therefrom are submitted to be allowable.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9-16 and 25-35 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Bell  
Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 1-20-05  
HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 512/867-8407  
Facsimile: 214/200-0853  
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com

A-172730\_1.DOC

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.	
on	<u>1/20/05</u>
Date	
Signature	<u>Nishi Pasarya</u>
Typed or Printed name of person signing Certificate	